



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

---

VOL. II.

No. 2.

---

## NOTES AND INSCRIPTIONS FROM ASIA MINOR.

---

### IX.—MANUEL'S CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE TURKS, A. D. 1176.

In the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1883, p. 402) I have shown that the small town of Sibia or Sublaion, which struck a few rare coins under the Roman Empire, and which was a Bishopric in Byzantine times, was situated where the modern village Homa stands. One of the most tragic events in Byzantine history, the battle which finally laid the Empire prostrate and helpless before the Seljuk Turks, took place beside Sibia, though as yet no one has ever suspected that the pass of Homa was the scene of the fight.

In the twelfth century the plain of Sibia and the pass which leads from it across the mountains into the province of Salutaris and the East, rose into importance from the peculiar conditions of the time. The history is obscure, and has never yet been properly explained. The key to it lies in the clear exposition of a name which occurs for the first time in historians of the period, and which has lasted till the present time: that name is Khoma,—or Homa, as the Turks still call the village which occupies the site of Sibia.

The name Khoma is mentioned several times during the twelfth century. It denotes a district or province guarded by certain troops, who are often called Khomatenoi or οἱ ἐκ τοῦ Χώματος. The passages in which it occurs are as follows:

ὅποσοι ἐκ τοῦ Χώματος ὤρμηγτο, Anna Komnena i. 131 (Bonn edition).

τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Χώματος, Anna i. 134, 170, 178.

τῶν Χωματηγῶν ἑξαρχον, Anna i. 29.

τὸν Βούρτζην τοπάρχην ὄντα Καππαδοκίας καὶ Χώματος, Anna i. 171.

(From Laodikeia on the Lykos) διὰ τοῦ Χώματος διελθὼν τὴν Αάμπην κατέλαβε . . . ἐφθαλῶς δὲ εἰς τὸ Πολύβοτον, Anna ii. 96.

From Apameia-Kelainai εἰς τὸ Χῶμα ἐλθὼν τῷ Μυριοκεφάλῳ ἐφίσταται, Niketas Chon., p. 231.

Ducange has correctly described the meaning of the term Khoma in writers of this late period,<sup>1</sup> though he has erred in supposing that Lykia was part of the Theme and that the Lykian Khoma was the central city in it. None of the later writers have taken any notice of the Theme Khoma.

The passages just quoted show that the Theme of Khoma lay east of Laodikeia, and that the road to Polybotos<sup>2</sup> passed through it. They also prove that the Theme existed when Alexios Komnenos ascended the throne A. D. 1081, but no older evidence exists to show at what time this new Theme was constituted. It is obviously a part of the older Anatolic Theme, as described by Constantine in the tenth century. Between the time of Constantine and that of Alexios Komnenos a vast change had come over the Anatolic Theme: great part of it, including the eastern and southern and much of the central regions, had been occupied by the Seljuk Turks and formed into a hostile monarchy. The Seljuk sovereigns had formed alliances with more than one of the Byzantine emperors or pretenders, and a condition of any such alliance necessarily was the recognition of the Seljuk suzerainty over that part of the Anatolic Theme which they claimed.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, a remarkable change is observable in the road-system of this district, when the wars of Alexios and Manuel make it possible, after many centuries of obscurity, to look again into the means of communication. The great highway, the path indicated by nature,

<sup>1</sup> See his note on Anna Komn. ii. p. 486, where he corrects the old false interpretation of the word.

<sup>2</sup> Polybotos or Polyboton is the modern Bolwadun.

<sup>3</sup> Finlay has correctly described the character and conditions of these alliances between the weakest Byzantine Emperors and the warlike Seljuks. The cession of territory is disguised or omitted by the Byzantine historians. It can be proved that Apameia-Kelainai and the country between it and Laodikeia *ad Lycum* was ceded in this way to the Seljuks.

from Laodikeia to the east, has often been described,<sup>4</sup> but in these late wars it is not employed. In 1092 Dukas marched from Philadelpheia in pursuit of the retreating Turks by way of Laodikeia and thence through the district Khoma by Lampe<sup>5</sup> to Polybotos. All the operations of Manuel in his fruitless attempt to drive back the tide of Turkish expansion in the years 1176–8 were directed on Sibia (Homa), and on points between Laodikeia and Sibia. The reason why this line of communication became so important about 1100 to 1200 A. D. is that the line of the old and natural highway lay in Turkish territory.<sup>6</sup> Laodikeia, Apameia, and the line of country between them were Turkish, and the plain of Sibia was an outpost of the Byzantine power, bordered on the south and the east by Seljuk territory. Close to Sibia a pass, called now Duz Bel, crosses the mountains which at that time divided the Byzantine from the Seljuk dominion. The pass over the Duz Bel then became an important *kleisoura* between Turkish and Byzantine territory, the fortress commanding it on the Byzantine side became a central point in the defence of the frontier, the routes leading to it became important military roads, the policy of the emperors who defended the frontier was concentrated on the maintenance of this border fortress, and the organization of the whole district was conducted with a view to this end. Such was the origin of the new Theme of Khoma.

The origin of the name Khoma as applied to this Theme is a point on which I can throw no light. The explanation advanced by Ducange (*l. c.*), that it is derived from the Lykian city Khoma, is inadmissible. It is hardly possible that the Theme Khoma can have included any part of Lykia. The passage quoted from Anna Komnena (I. 171) shows that the Theme of Khoma was conterminous with the Theme which in the twelfth century was dignified with the name of Kappadokia, and that the two Themes were under one general, Burtzes. Other passages (Anna II. 325 and 327) prove that Kappadokia at that period meant the plains north and north-east of Amorion: hence it is clear that the two Themes embraced the whole frontier-defence against the Seljuk kingdom of Ikonion.

<sup>4</sup> E. g., *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1882, p. 345. It goes by Apameia.

<sup>5</sup> Anna II. 96, quoted above.

<sup>6</sup> I must assume the results of my study of the local history of southern Phrygia, which is already in MS. ready for print.

Anna Komnena and Niketas, the only two writers who use the term Khoma, denote by it the district which I have described. The term, by an easy transition, was applied to the central fortress on which the defence of the whole district mainly depended, and in this sense the name has lasted till the present day. The village on the site of Sibliā is called by the Turks Homa. The term *Thema* in Byzantine writers means (1) the troops who guarded a province, (2) the country or province which they guarded, (3) the main fortress where they were stationed. The *καστρον Χαρσιανόν*, the central fortress of the Thema Kharsianon, had in all probability a distinct older name.<sup>7</sup>

When Manuel resolved to make one great effort to break the Turkish power, he began by refortifying a point on each of two great roads between Ikonion and the Byzantine territory. One point was Dorylaion, formerly an important military station, a *θέμα* and an *ἀπληκτον*, on the direct road from Constantinople to Ikonion: the other was Soublaion or Sibliā, the central fortress for the defence of the Theme of Khoma. He chose the latter route for delivering his great blow, wintered at Khonai (now called Honas), and in the following spring (A. D. 1176) marched directly against Ikonion.

In describing the subsequent operations, Niketas, our sole authority, uses two names, which are known only from this passage: MYRIO-KEPHALON and the TCHYVRIJI KLEISOURA. Close to Homa or Sibliā, an important pass crosses the neck connecting the Ak Dagħ with the Djebel Sultan Dagħ: this pass is now called the Duz Bel, "Level Neck."<sup>8</sup>

Leaving the plain of Sibliā, the road climbs the grassy hillside by an almost perpendicular ascent of 1500 feet or more. After this first steep climb, the pass lies before us straight and open, whence the name, "Level Neck." About two miles further east the road forks, one branch leading to the Tchul Ovasi (Metropolitanus Campus)

<sup>7</sup> It is probably the almost impregnable rock of Mushalem Kale.

<sup>8</sup> The pass is not marked in any map, and seems not to have been traversed by any modern traveller till we crossed it in 1883. At the present time a traveller from Ala Sheher (Philadelpheia) to Konia would probably, and a traveller from any part of the higher Maeander valley would certainly, be recommended by the muleteers to cross the Duz Bel. By a fortunate accident I was led to choose this route, otherwise Manuel's campaign against the Turks would still be unintelligible to me.

goes to the right down a long narrow defile called Turrije Boghaz; the other turns to the left and descends another more open defile towards Sandykli.<sup>9</sup>

Such was the pass which the emperor Manuel crossed on his ill-fated expedition. He reached a ruined fort named Myriocephalon, and had then before him a long defile, the Tehyvriji Kleisoura, (*αἱ κλήσουραι τοῦ Τζυβρίτζη κατονομάζονται ἃς καὶ ἤμελλον 'Ρωμαῖοι μετὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Μυριοκεφάλου παρίεναι ἀπαρσιν*, Niket. Chon. 231). Against the advice of his officers, he marched into this defile with his whole army in long scattered array, without any precaution; and the Turks, who occupied the heights on each side, slaughtered the Byzantine troops without difficulty or danger.

The description suits the Turrije Boghaz excellently, as far as I can judge from its appearance.<sup>10</sup> The very name may be the same which Niketas writes *Τζυβρίτζή*, obviously a Greek rendering of a Turkish name.<sup>11</sup> Myriocephalon then was a fort on the Duz Bel: and we were informed at Homa that ruins existed on the Bel, though in our rapid march we did not observe them. It is probable that, when the Iconoclast Emperors organized the defence of the empire against the Arabs, they built the fortress of Myriocephalon, which was a ruin in the twelfth century. This pass could have become an important one only during the long wars against the Arab marauders.<sup>12</sup>

After Manuel's army had been almost annihilated by the Turks, the Seljuk sultan, Kiliġ Arslan, offered him peace on condition of destroying Dorylaion and Soublaion; and he returned again, necessarily by the same road, to Khonai, dismantling the lately restored fortifications of Soublaion as he passed (*τὸ Σούβλαιον ἐπιπαριῶν . . . . . καθαιρεῖ*, Niket. Chon.). From this time onward, the valley of Sibia has been in Turkish hands, and the population has adopted the Mohammedan religion.

<sup>9</sup> I have traversed only the second defile: the first is the main road to the East.

<sup>10</sup> I looked down the pass from the Duz Bel, and also looked up the pass from its other end south of Kizil Euren.

<sup>11</sup> *τζη* is the Greek rendering of the common Turkish ending *ji*.

<sup>12</sup> It is important only in defence against an enemy from the East.

## X.—FINES SAGALASSENSIUM.

In June, 1884, I found the following inscription in the cemetery of Deuer, a village at the south end of the lake of Buldur. It is engraved very roughly and carelessly on a large block of unsmoothed limestone. The surface of the stone is exceedingly uneven, and the letters are very faint. Seeing its importance, I spent the great part of two days working at it, but the reading of l. 16 is still uncertain. I am indebted to a most ingenious restoration by Prof. Mommsen of lines 13 to 15, the interpretation of which baffled me while I was studying the stone. While working at this inscription, I was just recovering from a sharp attack of fever, and on the first day was hardly able to stand upright: and, as the stone was buried in the ground upside down, I suffered much from the great heat and the constrained position which I was obliged to occupy: an examination under more favorable conditions may yet give the reading of l. 16.

ε \_ ΕΤΙCΤΟΛΙΙ ███ ΘΕ  
 ΟΥ ███ C Ε Β Α C ███ ΟΥ  
 ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙ ███ ███ ███ ΙCΑΡΟC  
 ΚΟΙΝΤΟCΤΕΤΡΩΝΙ  
 5 ΟCΟΥΜΒ ███ ΠΡΕCΒΕΥΤΗC  
 ΚΑΙΑΝΤΙCΤΡΑΤΗΓΟCΝΕΡΩ  
 ███ ΟCΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΥΚΑΙCΑΡΟC  
 CΕΒΑCΤΟΥΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΟΥ  
 ΛΟ ███ ΟCΤΟΥΠΤΙΟCΤΡΑΙ  
 10 CΗ ███ ΤΡΟΤΟCΝ ███ ΩΝΟC  
 ΚΛΑ ΙΟΥ ΑΙC ΟCCE  
 ΟΥΓΕ ΜΑΝΙΚΟΥΩ  
 ΡΟΟCΤΗC \NTAME Ι  
 ΔΕ ΙΑΕΙΝ/ ███ ΛΑCCEΩΝ  
 15 ΤΑΔΕΕΝΑ ΤΕΡΑΚ  
 Ι\Ο ΤΥΜΒΡΙΑΝΑC  
 ΚΛΑΥ ΑΙCΑ  
 ΕΡΜ

Throughout this inscription there is hardly a single letter which is clear and certain: it was deciphered, symbol by symbol, with hesitation and laborious comparison. Hence, in the difficult line 16 there is no letter except N of which I am positively certain, and the horizontal stroke of the T is very much extended on the right, though I

could see no trace to warrant the reading Π. In line 2 the word *θεοῦ* is engraved over the erased name of Nero. In l. 5 the impossible reading BOB appeared, after frequent examination, to be on the stone.

Ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς] θεοῦ Σεβασ[τ]οῦ Γερμανι[χοῦ Κα]ίσαρος Κοῖντος Πετρώνιος Οὐμβ[ερ?] πρεσβευτῆς καὶ ἀντιστρατηγὸς Νέρω[ν]ος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ [καὶ] Λο[ύκι]ος Πούπιος Πραῖσις[υς ἐπι]τροπος Ν[έρ]ωνος Κλαυδίου [Κ]αίσα[αρ]ος Σε[βαστ]οῦ Γε[ρ]μανικοῦ ὠροθέτησαν τὰ με[ν ἐν] δε[ξί] ἡ ἐν[αι Σαγα]λασσέων, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἀ[ρις]τερῇ . . . . . [Νέρωνος] Κλαυ[δίου Κ]αίσα[ρος Σεβαστοῦ Γ]ερμ[ανικοῦ].

“In accordance with a rescript of the Emperor Nero [the name *Nero* has been erased, and the word *God* substituted] Germanicus Caesar, Quintus Petronius Umber, lieutenant with power of praetor of the Emperor Nero Claudius Caesar Germanicus, and Lucius Pupius Praesens, procurator of the Emperor Nero Claudius Caesar Germanicus, fixed the boundary, that what lies on the right should belong to the Sagalassians, and what lies on the left should belong to the . . . [estate] of the Emperor Nero Claudius Caesar Germanicus.”

In the village of Deuer I found another inscription, which is a companion to the preceding. It is engraved on a block of limestone which has been hollowed out to form a large mortar. Only a few letters remain at the ends of the lines, along the edge of the stone on the right.

	/	10	▨
	OC		II
	C		▨ ▨
	KAI		C C
5	NOC		Ω
	POC BAC	15	ΕΡΚ
	OY I KAI		OC
	CTTPAI		YOYE
	PΩ		AAAC

In line 13 the second C is probably part of O or Ω, and in line 18 the Λ is very doubtful. The first ten lines of this inscription were identical with eleven of the preceding: the rest probably contained a similar formula in reverse order. The word [Σαγ]αλασσέων seems to be the end of the whole.

A third inscription was discovered in the same village by Mr. A. H. Smith, who visited Deuer on the day before I passed through it.



I also copied it. It shows that in the reign of Diocletian this district was still part of the territory of Sagalassos.

These inscriptions prove with definite certainty that, throughout the Roman period, the whole valley along the east and south of the lake of Buldur belonged to Sagalassos. It is, of course, obvious that this state of affairs existed before the Roman supremacy began, and was permitted to continue under their government. Therefore we may consider it certain that, in the second and third centuries before Christ, the country lying along the east and south of the lake was included in "finēs Sagalassensium."

This discovery throws a new and utterly unexpected light on the passage of Livy which describes the route of the consul Manlius in his expedition against Galatia. Hitherto, it has been exceedingly difficult to see how Manlius passed through the territory of the Sagalassians. The furthest point to the south-east which Livy mentions is Termessos: a glance at the map shows how far Sagalassos lies out of the natural route from Termessos to Galatia. An acquaintance with the natural features of the country makes it still more difficult to understand how Manlius could have gone through Sagalassos. The mountain barrier north of that city would force him, as it had before forced Alexander, to turn westward and march along the north-eastern end of lake Askania (lake of Buldur).

Professor G. Hirschfeld<sup>13</sup> saw clearly the apparently insuperable difficulties which are occasioned by the supposition that Manlius marched from Termessos by Sagalassos. He recognized, what is indubitable to one who knows the country, that, if Manlius passed through the valley of Sagalassos, he must have been marching not from Termessos, but from Pamphylia proper, the country adjoining Perga, Attaleia, and Aspendos. On the other hand, Livy never mentions the advance of Manlius beyond Termessos; and the words of Polybios<sup>14</sup> are opposed to such a supposition. But we now see that there is no necessity to suppose that Manlius ever went into the valley of Sagalassos; and, if we read Livy without that prejudice in mind, his account is clear, simple and accurate.

Manlius returned from the neighborhood of Termessos, crossed the river Istanos (Tauros), passed by Alifachreddin Keui (Xylene

<sup>13</sup> *Reisebericht*, published in BERLIN. MONATSBER., 1879; also *Gratulationschrift der Königsberg. Univers. für d. archaeol. Institut in Rom*, 1879.

<sup>14</sup> Polyb. xxii, 18, ὁ δὲ Γνάιος συνεγγίσας τῇ Τερμησσῶ.

Kome), marched past Andeda and Pogla through the pass leading to the Gebren valley in several days (*continentibus itineribus*), sacked Kormasa in the Gebren valley, and then proceeded along the southern and eastern side of the Buldur lake (Askania, *παρὰ τὴν λίμνην*), through the territory of the Sagalassians. At the north-eastern end of the lake the road which he took joins the road from Sagalassos, by which, according to Prof. Hirschfeld's supposition, he would have travelled. Thus, we see that Manlius, after his interference in Pamphylian affairs, marched towards Galatia by the easiest and straightest way, which is marked out by nature as the proper road for a traveller. From the N. E. end of the lake Askania to the Campus Metropolitanus, I have, in a former paper,<sup>15</sup> traced the route of the Roman army. I have only one addition to make to the reasoning in that paper. In it I proved that the *Rhotrini fontes*, mentioned by Livy, are the beautiful springs, called Bash Bunar, in the valley behind Apameia, and that the violent alteration of the text into *Obrimae fontes* could not be accepted. I did not observe that the true reading must be *Rhocrinus fontes*. The Greek name of the fountains is, as I then proved, *πηγὴ Ἀβροχρηγὴ* or *Ἀβροχληγὴ* or *Ἀβροχρηγὴ*: and the last form, with omission of the initial vowel-sound, gives the Latin form.

I may make one more slight alteration in the text of Livy.—From Kormasa, Manlius advanced to Darsa. On the route just described, Buldur would be the next town after Kormasa. Now Buldur is, as I shall hereafter try to prove, the ancient Durzela, Zarzila, or Zorzila. The change from Darsam to Darsilam is not great.

I have mentioned that the lake along which Manlius marched must be the Buldur Göl. Leake stands almost alone among modern geographers in holding this opinion: it is always pleasant to find new proofs of his marvellous sagacity in divining what has required many years to prove.

The inscriptions published above show that, during the first century after Christ, the district was included in the Roman province of Galatia. It was afterwards, when the province Lycia-Pamphylia was constituted, transferred to the latter, and it appears so in Ptolemy.

W. M. RAMSAY.

<sup>15</sup> *Metropolitanus Campus*, in the JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES, 1883.